



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,378	09/24/2003	Masayuki Takahashi	1035-468	4802

23117 7590 09/06/2007  
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC  
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER
----------

FOLAYAN, TEMITAYO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2609

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/06/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/668,378	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAKAHASHI, MASAYUKI	
	<b>Examiner</b> Temitayo Folayan	<b>Art Unit</b> 2609	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003:
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 6 and 7 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), because of the following informalities:

Regarding Claim 6, it is objected to because of the following informalities:

In lines 3,5 and 7 of claim 6, reads "protrusion axes", however, in line 11 of claim 6, discloses "protrusion axis". The examiner suggests "protrusion axes" be changed to read "protrusion axis". Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding Claim 7, it is objected to because of the following informalities:

In lines 3,5 and 7 of claim 7, reads "protrusion axes", however, in line 11 of claim 7, discloses "protrusion axis". The examiner suggests "protrusion axes" be changed to read "protrusion axis". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (United States Patent 6,856,423 B2), hereinafter referenced as Anderson, in view of Yamada. (United States Patent 6,188,486 B1), hereinafter referenced as Yamada.

Art Unit: 2609

Regarding Claim 1, Anderson discloses a dual scanner system. In addition Anderson discloses "A contact area-sensor, comprising: a plurality of image scanners, each of which includes an image scanning sensor substrate in which a plurality of sensor sections are aligned in a matrix manner so as to scan an image", furthermore Anderson discloses an image reproduction system (10) which reads on claimed "a contact area sensor", as disclosed at column 4, lines 3-5; first scanner (20) and second scanner (22) which reads on claimed "plurality of image sensors" as disclosed at column 4, lines 33-35; a light source for each side of medium (12) and a sensor array which converts the light into electrical signals which reads on claimed "each of which includes an image scanning sensor substrate in which a plurality of sensor sections are aligned in a matrix manner so as to scan an image", as disclosed at column 4 lines 33-46, however Anderson fails to disclose a connecting line having flexibility, for connecting the plurality of image scanners to each other. However the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art for the dual scanner system disclosed in Anderson to provide a connecting line having flexibility, for connecting the plurality of image scanners to each other, as taught by Yamada.

In a similar field of endeavor Yamada discloses a printing system. In addition Yamada discloses "a connecting line having flexibility, for connecting the plurality of image scanners to each other", furthermore Yamada disclose an embodiment (1) connecting an image scanner (3) to a storage device (4) with a cable (5) which reads on "a connecting line having flexibility, for connecting the plurality of image scanners to each other" as disclosed at column 5, lines 59-63.

Art Unit: 2609

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the dual scanner system of Anderson by specifically providing connecting cables, as taught by Yamada, for the purpose of connecting the printer, a computer terminal device, an image scanner and a storage device.

2. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Yamada further in view of Spence-Bate. (United States Patent 4,125,324), hereinafter referenced as Spence-Bate.

Regarding Claim 2, Anderson and Yamada disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however Anderson and Yamada fail to disclose connection to dual scanner system via hinge member. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include hinge member with dual scanner system, as taught by Spence-Bate.

In a similar field of endeavor Spence-Bate discloses a copying apparatus that contains a hinge member. In addition Spence-Bate discloses "the image scanners are rotatably connected to each other by a hinge member ", furthermore Spence-Bate discloses a hinge point (4) in which two glass plates (2 and 3) can pivot allowing a record (5) to be inserted between them which reads on "the image scanners are rotatably connected to each other by a hinge member" as disclosed at column 4, lines 8-12.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anderson and Yamada by specifically providing

Art Unit: 2609

a hinge member, as taught by Spence-Bate, for the purpose of copying a record by hinging two materials along a hinge axis.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate further in view of Wakeman. (United States Patent 4,150,896), hereinafter referenced as Wakeman.

Regarding claim 3, Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 2), however Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate fail to disclose a detachable hinge member. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include a detachable hinge member with dual scanner system, as taught by Wakeman.

In a similar field of endeavor Wakeman discloses a copying apparatus with a detachable hinge member, In addition Wakeman discloses "the hinge member is detachable from each of the image scanners ", furthermore Wakeman discloses a device the contains easily attachable and detachable hinges which reads on "the hinge member is detachable from each of the image scanners" as disclosed at column 6, lines 30-40.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the dual scanner system of Anderson and Yamada further in view of Spence-Bate by specifically providing a detachable hinge, as taught by Wakeman, for the purpose of allowing the copying apparatus to have a selection of pivotal operations.

Art Unit: 2609

Regarding claim 4, Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 2), however Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate fail to disclose connection to dual scanner system via hinge member fixed at a 90-degree angle. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include hinge member fixed at a 90 degree angle with device, as taught by Spence-Bate.

Spence-Bate discloses a copying apparatus that contains a hinge member fixed to open at a 90-degree angle, In addition Spence-Bate discloses "the hinge member connecting the image scanners to each other allows the image scanners to be fixed at an opened angle of 90 degrees", furthermore Spence-Bate discloses a device being rotatable about a 90 degree angle hinge axis which reads on "the hinge member connecting the image scanners to each other allows the image scanners to be fixed at an opened angle of 90 degrees" as disclosed at column 4, lines 13 and 14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the dual scanning system of Anderson and Yamada by specifically providing a hinge member that is fixed to open at 90 degrees, as taught by Spence-Bate, for the purpose of hinging a material in a copying apparatus to be rotatable through at least a 90 degree hinge axis.

4. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate further in view of Niesen et al. (United States Patent 3,717,411), hereinafter referenced as Niesen.

Regarding claim 6, Anderson, Yamada further and Spence-Bate disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 4), however Anderson, Yamada further and Spence-Bate fail to disclose hinge member with extended axis and spring member, which pull one axis to another. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include hinge member and spring member with device, as taught by Niesen.

In a similar field of endeavor Niesen discloses a hinge member connected in a way as to where the scanning surfaces are connected by a supported spring member. In addition Niesen discloses "the hinge member comprises: protrusion axes, each of which is protruded from one end of a lateral face of one of the image scanners; a rectangle plate hung on the protrusion axes, including a long hole created in a linear shape in a hanging direction for allowing the protrusion axes to pass through, and a notch created perpendicular to the hanging direction; and a spring made of an elastic body, which pulls one of the protrusion axis toward the other protrusion axis", furthermore Niesen discloses "A pin 79 is slidably received in the opening 77, which pin includes a head 80. A spring 81 has one end thereof engaging the top of the head 80 of the pin, the other end of this spring being engaged with ledge surface 33a of the frame member 33." Which reads on "the hinge member comprises: protrusion axes, each of which is protruded from one end of a lateral face of one of the image scanners; a rectangle plate hung on the protrusion axes, including a long hole created in a linear shape in a hanging direction for allowing the protrusion axes to pass through" as disclosed at column 6, lines 20-24. Furthermore Niesen discloses "The spring 81 is held in place by a pin 82; this spring constantly urges the pin 79 downwardly" which reads on



Art Unit: 2609

“a notch created perpendicular to the hanging direction; and a spring made of an elastic body, which pulls one of the protrusion axis toward the other protrusion axis” as disclosed at column 6, lines 24-26.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify hinge member of Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate by specifically providing a spring-like hinge member, as taught by Niesen, for the purpose of holding the copying apparatus in the loading position.

Regarding claim 5, Anderson, Yamada further and Spence-Bate disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 2), however Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate fail to disclose connection to image scanning device via hinge member fixed at a 180-degree angle. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include hinge member fixed at a 180 degree angle with device, as taught by Niesen.

In a similar field of endeavor Niesen discloses a copying apparatus that contains a hinge member fixed to open at a 180-degree angle, in addition Niesen discloses “the hinge member connecting the image scanners to each other allows the image scanners to be fixed at an opened angle of 180 ”, furthermore Niesen discloses “mounting means supporting said frame in said opening for pivoting movement through 180.degree” which reads on “the hinge member connecting the image scanners to each other allows the image scanners to be fixed at an opened angle of 180” as disclosed at column 9, lines 55 and 56.

Art Unit: 2609

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the dual scanning device of Anderson in view of Yamada further in view of Spence-Bate by specifically providing a hinge member that is fixed to open at 180 degrees, as taught by Niesen, for the purpose of allowing pivotal movement in the copying apparatus.

Regarding claim 7, Anderson, Yamada further and Spence-Bate disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5), however Anderson, Yamada further and Spence-Bate fail to disclose hinge member with extended axis and spring member, which pull one axis to another. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include hinge member and spring member with device, as taught by Niesen.

In a similar field of endeavor Niesen discloses a hinge member connected in a way as to where the scanning surfaces are connected by a supported spring member. In addition Niesen discloses "the hinge member comprises: protrusion axes, each of which is protruded from one end of a lateral face of one of the image scanners; a rectangle plate hung on the protrusion axes, including a long hole created in a linear shape in a hanging direction for allowing the protrusion axes to pass through, and a notch created perpendicular to the hanging direction; and a spring made of an elastic body, which pulls one of the protrusion axis toward the other protrusion axis", furthermore Niesen discloses "A pin 79 is slidably received in the opening 77, which pin includes a head 80. A spring 81 has one end thereof engaging the top of the head 80 of the pin, the other end of this spring being engaged with ledge surface 33a of the frame member 33." Which reads on "the hinge member comprises: protrusion axes, each of

Art Unit: 2609

which is protruded from one end of a lateral face of one of the image scanners; a rectangle plate hung on the protrusion axes, including a long hole created in a linear shape in a hanging direction for allowing the protrusion axes to pass through” as disclosed at column 6, lines 20-24. Furthermore Niesen discloses “The spring 81 is held in place by a pin 82; this spring constantly urges the pin 79 downwardly” which reads on “a notch created perpendicular to the hanging direction; and a spring made of an elastic body, which pulls one of the protrusion axis toward the other protrusion axis” as disclosed at column 6, lines 24-26.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the scanning device of Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate by specifically providing a hinge member (that contains a spring-like member), that is fixed to open at 180 degrees, as taught by Niesen, for the purpose of loading the copying apparatus.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate further in view of Hong. (United States Patent 6,268,997), hereinafter referenced as Hong.

Regarding claim 9, Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 2), however Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate fail to disclose a hinge member with a cord internally connected. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include a hinge member with a cord internally connected with device, as taught by Hong.

Art Unit: 2609

In a similar field of endeavor Hong discloses an apparatus that contains hinge member that has interconnected cable, in addition Hong discloses "The connecting line is internally included in the hinge member", furthermore Hong discloses a hinge unit containing a hollow passage allowing a cable to pass through said hinge unit which reads on "The connecting line is internally included in the hinge member" as disclosed at column 5, lines 34-44.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the hinge member of Anderson, Yamada and Spence-Bate by specifically providing a hinge member that included an internally connected line or cord, as taught by Hong, for the purpose of convenience.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Yamada further in view of Cantwell. (United States Patent 7,136,199 B2), hereinafter referenced as Cantwell.

Regarding claim 8, Anderson and Yamada disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however Anderson and Yamada fail to disclose magnet members that fix the surfaces to one another. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include magnet members with device, as taught by Cantwell.

In a similar field of endeavor Cantwell discloses a document scanning apparatus that fixes one set of surfaces to another via magnets, in addition Cantwell discloses "the image scanners include a magnet between the image scanners, which fixes the image scanners when the image scanners are overlaid with each other and which allows the

Art Unit: 2609

image scanners to be freely joined together or removed from each other”, furthermore Cantwell discloses “the base unit is defined by four corners and the cover is defined by four corresponding corners, and further wherein the alignment device comprises magnets located adjacent each of the four corners defining the base unit and the four corresponding corners defining the cover. ” which reads on “the image scanners include a magnet between the image scanners, which fixes the image scanners when the image scanners are overlaid with each other and which allows the image scanners to be freely joined together or removed from each other” as disclosed at column 17, lines 32-36.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the scanning device of Anderson and Yamada by specifically providing a scanner that included magnets, as taught by Cantwell, for the purpose of securing the optical scanning device to the base unit of the device.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Yamada further in view of Trantow et al. (United States Patent 5,987,991), hereinafter referenced as Trantow.

Regarding claim 10, Anderson and Yamada disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however Anderson and Yamada fail to disclose dual scanning surfaces that can scan individually. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include dual scanning surfaces that can scan individually with the device, as taught by Trantow.

In a similar field of endeavor Trantow discloses a scanning apparatus that contains more than one separate surface that can individually scan, in addition Trantow discloses "the image scanners can be individually driven for scanning images", furthermore Trantow discloses a scanning apparatus that contains a dual pair of transducers that can individually scan which reads on "the image scanners can be individually driven for scanning images" as disclosed at column 4, lines 57-61.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the scanning device of Anderson and Yamada by specifically providing separate individually scanning surfaces, as taught by Trantow, for the purpose of freely scanning surfaces.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Yamada further in view of Lemelson. (United States Patent 5,966,457), hereinafter referenced as Lemelson.

Regarding claim 11, Anderson and Yamada disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however Anderson and Yamada fail to disclose a method of sequentially scanning an image. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include a method of sequentially scanning with the device, as taught by Lemelson.

In a similar field of endeavor Lemelson discloses a scanning apparatus that can sequentially scan an image, in addition Lemelson discloses "the image scanners can be sequentially driven for scanning images", furthermore Lemelson discloses an apparatus (shown in Fig. 9) that can scan simultaneously or sequentially which reads

Art Unit: 2609

on "the image scanners can be sequentially driven for scanning images" as disclosed at column 18, lines 58 and 59.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the scanning device of Anderson and Yamada by specifically providing a scanner that scans surfaces sequentially, as taught by Lemelson, for the purpose of sequentially and simultaneously scanning a code such as a barcode.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Yamada further in view of Shimizu. (United States Patent 5,085,973), hereinafter referenced as Shimizu.

Regarding claim 12, Anderson and Yamada disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however Anderson and Yamada fail to disclose a substrate containing lights that emit red, green and blue light patterns. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include a substrate containing lights that emit red, green and blue light patterns with the device, as taught by Shimizu.

In a similar field of endeavor Shimizu discloses a filter system that contains a substrate with light patterns of blue, green and red, in addition Shimizu discloses "each of the image scanners includes a backlight on a rear surface of the image scanning sensor substrate, the backlight sequentially turning on red light, green light and blue light in a sub-frame period", furthermore Shimizu discloses a printing process that contains a substrate uses the color filter process using red-, green- and-blue colored

Art Unit: 2609

image elements which reads on “the backlight sequentially turning on red light, green light and blue light in a sub-frame period” as disclosed at column 1, lines 12-18.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the scanning device of Anderson and Yamada by specifically providing a substrate contains a backlight that sequentially switches between red, green and blue lights, as taught by Shimizu, for the purpose of acting as an optical waveguide.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Yamada further in view of Hsieh. (United States Patent 6,791,720), hereinafter referenced as Hsieh.

Regarding claim 13, Anderson and Yamada disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however Anderson and Yamada fail to disclose a scanning apparatus that contains a storing means such as a USB device. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include a storing means (USB) with the device, as taught by Hsieh.

In a similar field of endeavor Hsieh discloses a memory storage device (USB), in addition Shimizu discloses “at least one of the image scanners includes detachable storing means, which stores all image information scanned by the image scanners”, furthermore Shimizu discloses a portable scanning apparatus which is connected to a universal serial bus (USB) which reads on “at least one of the image scanners includes detachable storing means, which stores all image information scanned by the image scanners” as disclosed at column 4, lines 10-14.



Art Unit: 2609

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the scanning device of Anderson and Yamada by specifically providing a USB port for the scanner, as taught by Hsieh, for the purpose of portable transporting memory.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and Yamada further in view of Wang et al. (United States Patent 6,400,484 B1), hereinafter referenced as Wang.

Regarding claim 14, Anderson and Yamada disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), however Anderson and Yamada fail to disclose a scanning apparatus that has a mode for scanning a transparent document or reflective document, and furthermore contains a means for switching between these two modes. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to include a mode for scanning a transparent document or reflective document, and furthermore contains a means for switching between these two modes, as taught by Wang.

In a similar field of endeavor Wang discloses a scanning device that contains a state for scanning transparent images and a state for scanning lightproof or reflective images. Furthermore the scanning device contains a means for switching between these two states, in addition Shimizu discloses "each of the image scanners is provided with translucent/lightproof switching means on the rear surface of the image scanning sensor substrate, for carrying out switching between a transparent state and a lightproof", furthermore Shimizu discloses "There are three methods to set the scanner 30 to scan transparent and reflective documents. The first method is to install an option

Art Unit: 2609

switch (not shown) on the scanner 30 that connects to the control circuit 40 indicating whether the document to be scanned is transparent or reflective. The second method is to use software installed on a computer to indicate the control circuit 40 whether the document to be scanned is transparent or reflective. The third method is to install a sensor (not shown) on the scanner 30 that can detect whether the reflecting surface module 45 is mounted on the scanning module 36. The control circuit 40 then determines whether the first light source 42 is used to illuminate the scanning 37 according to the output of the sensor." Which reads on "each of the image scanners is provided with translucent/lightproof switching means on the rear surface of the image scanning sensor substrate, for carrying out switching between a transparent state and a lightproof" as disclosed at column 3, lines 55-67.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the scanning device of Anderson and Yamada by specifically providing a state for scanning transparent images and a state for scanning reflective images, as taught by Wang, for the purpose of containing a means for switching between the two states in the scanning device.

Art Unit: 2609

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Temitayo Folayan whose telephone number is 571-270-3574. The examiner can normally be reached on mon-thurs 7:30-5:00 est.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jefferey Harold can be reached on 571-272-7519. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



TF  
August 28, 2007

Temitayo Folayan  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2609



JEFFEREY F. HAROLD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER